# File 15

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

06 NOV 15 PM 4: 26

ALBERT F. CATANACH, JR.,

CLERK-SANTA FE

Plaintiff,

CIV C & - 1115 L

LH RHS

v.

CITI CARDS/BANK,

Defendant.

### NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Defendant Citi Cards/Bank ("Defendant"), through its attorneys, Holland & Hart 11P, hereby respectfully submits this Notice of Removal for the purpose of removing the above-entitled action from the Magistrate Court, County of Santa Fe. State of New Mexico, to the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, and as grounds therefore states:

- 1. Defendant has been named in the civil action commenced by Plaintiff in the Magistrate Court for the County of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, entitled *Albert F. Catanach*, *Jr., Plaintiff, v. Citi Cards Bank, Defendant*, case number M-49-CV-2006-01237-D-3.
- 2. Defendant first received notice of this action upon receipt of a copy of the Summons and Civil Complaint on October 26, 2006. Copies of the Summons and Civil Complaint are attached to this Notice of Removal as Exhibit A.
- 3. In compliance with D.N.M.LR-Civ. 81.1(a), copies of other records and proceedings from the state court action are attached to this Notice of Removal as Exhibit B.

- 4. This action is being removed because Plaintiff alleges he is entitled to damages for Defendant's failure to credit his account in accordance with the Fair Credit Billing Act. 15 U.S.C. §§ 1666a 1666i. See Ex. A, at 2.
- 5. Each claim Plaintiff asserts in his Complaint arises out of the Fair Credit Billing Act. See id. 6.
- 6. Because of the express invocation of a federal statutory remedy (recovery under the Fair Credit Billing Act). Plaintiff's Civil Complaint is removable to this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) (general federal question jurisdiction provision) as an action arising under federal law within the Court's original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 7. The state court in which this action was commenced is within this Court's district and division. Therefore, this action is properly removable to this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a) and 1446.
- 8. Undersigned counsel consents to this removal on behalf of the sole defendant to this cause of action.
- 9. Defendant will serve and certify service of copies of this Notice of Removal to Plaintiff, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).
- 10. A copy of this Notice of Removal will be filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Magistrate Court, Santa Fe County, State of New Mexico, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays that the above-captioned action now pending against it in the Magistrate Court, County of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be removed to this Court.

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of November, 2006.

HOLLAND & HARTLER

By: Trent A. Howell

Post Office Box 2208

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208

505.988.4421

Attorneys for DEFENDANT CITI CARDS/BANK

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 15th day of November, 2006, I served a copy of the foregoing document to the following by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid:

☑ U.S. Mail, postage prepaid☐ Hand Delivery☐ Fax

Albert F. Catanach, Jr. 103 W. Barcelona Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Trent A. Howell

 $3632480] \perp \mathrm{DOC}$ 

[2-202, 3-20**2**] 884-3916-cv<sub>1</sub>01115-LH-RHS Document 1 Filed 11/15/06 Page 5 of 10

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT

COUNTY OF SANTA FE

ALBERT F. CATANACH JR., Plaintiff(s)

Vs.

No. M-49-CV-2006-01237-DIV. 03

CITI CARDS/BANK, Defendant(s)

# CIVIL SUMMONS THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

TO: CITI CARDS/BANK

LEGAL DEPARTMENT ATTN: S. LARSON

Address 701 EAST 50<sup>TH</sup> STREET NORTH

P.O. BOX 6034

SIOUX FALLS, SD 57117



#### **GREETINGS:**

This summons notifies you that a Complaint has been filed against you. A copy of the complaint is attached to this summons. You are required to serve and file an Answer to the Complaint, or a responsive motion, within TWENTY (20) DAYS AFTER THE SUMMONS HAS BEEN SERVED ON YOU. You must file the Answer or responsive motion with the Clerk of the MAGISTRATE Court and you must serve a copy of the Answer or responsive motion on the opposing party.

IF YOU DO NOT FILE AND SERVE AN ANSWER OR RESPONSIVE MOTION WITHIN THE TWENTY (20) DAY PERIOD, A DEFAULT JUDGMENT MAY BE ENTERED AGAINST YOU FOR THE MONEY OR OTHER RELIEF DEMANDED IN THE COMPLAINT.

Your answer must be filed with the above named court which is located at: SANTA FE MAGISTRATE COURT 2056 S. GALISTEO ST. SANTA FE, NM 87505

A copy of your answer must be mailed to the plaintiff or to the plaintiff's attorney.

Name and Address of Plaintiff or Plaintiff's Attorney:

Name: ALBERT F. CATANACH JR.

Address 103 W. BARCELONA SANTA FE, NM 87505

WITNESS the Honorable Magistrate Judge JUDGE RICHARD M. PADILLA Magistrate Judge of said Court of the State of New Mexico and the Seal of the MAGISTRATE Court of said County, this 3<sup>RD</sup> day of OCTOBER, 2006.

-1-

JUDGE RICHARD M. PADILLA

**Distribution Instructions** 

1 copy - Court 1 copy - Service 1 copy - Return of Service

[Supreme Court Approved, August 13, 1992; as amended effective January 1, 1993.]

EXHIBIT

A

Civil Form 4-204

IN THE MAGISTRATE COURT COUNTY OF SANTA FE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Case No. M. 19-CV Stob -01237- D-3

ALBERT F. CATANACH JR., 120013

Plaintiff,

CITI CARDS/BANK 152 539

Defendant.



#### CIVIL COMPLAINT

- 1. Plaintiff Albert F. Catanach Jr., resides, or may be found in, or the cause of action arose in this county
- 2. Plaintiff claims from Defendant the amount of \$9,900 which includes interest and court costs.
  - 3. Plaintiff's claim arises from the following events or transactions
- a. Plaintiff purchased material goods via Credit Card issued by Citi Bank also known as Citi Cards. Plaintiff's transactions were as follows:
  - 1. DRMS-Government Liquidation, 1/30/06, \$5074
  - 2. DRMS-Government Liquidation, 2/27/06. \$4053.
- 4. Plaintiff indicated to Citi Cards that both transactions had either damaged or missing goods and were not delivered as agreed Plaintiff indicated that they had tried to send the goods back to the merchant but they had refused to accept any goods. Additionally the Plaintiff shipped back many of the products due to defect and the merchant refused the shipment.

Case 1:06-cv-01115<u>-LH</u>-RHS Document 1 Filed 11/15/06 Page 7 of 10

5. Phone calls were made to Citi Cards in February and March of 2006 for both transactions

indicating the damaged goods and Plaintiff's attempt to send back the goods. Letters were sent in

March of 2006 for both transactions.

6 Plaintiff claims the following under the Fair Credit Billing Act:

a. Defendant failed to credit Plaintiff's account due to "charges for goods and or

services Plaintiff didn't accept or weren't delivered as agreed." DRMS Government Liquidation had

either parts missing from the goods, most were damaged, and many of the goods were not delivered as

agreed Additionally, Plaintiff sent back the damaged goods to DRMS Government Liquidation and

sent tracking receipts to Citi Cards.

b. Citi Cards did not resolve the disputes within two billing cycles as the law requires.

Dispute Letters were sent to Citi Cards in March of 2006 and Citi Cards did not resolve the dispute

until August and September of 2006. This is well over the 90 day requirement of the Fair Credit

Billing Act.

c. Under the Fair Credit Billing Act any creditor who fails to follow the settlement

procedure, as the Defendant has, may not collect the amount in dispute, or any related finance charges,

up to \$50, even if the bill turns out to be correct. Additionally, Citi Cards refused to post credits to the

account for returned goods as shown via returned tracking receipts.

Wherefore Plaintiff Prays that the amount charged for both transactions to DRMS Government

Liquidation to include court costs and finance charges be awarded to Plaintiff in the amount of \$9,900.

Respectfully Submitted,

ALBERT F. CATANACH JR. 103 W BARCELONA

SANTA FE, NM 87505

505-428-7502

PRO SE

2

		RETURN
STAT	TE OF NEW MEXICO )	NOT ONLY
	) ss	
COU	NTY OF SANTA FE )	
(chech	k one box and fill in appropriate blanks)	
[ ]	I, being duly sworn, on oath, say that I am	over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to this lawsui
	and that I served the within Summons (in	said county) (in Minnehana County) on the day
	of October , 2006, by	delivering a copy thereof, with copy of Complaint attached, and
	a form for Answer, in the following mann	ner:
	k only if service by sheriff or deputy)	
[ ]	I certify that I served the within Summons	(in said county) (inCounty) on the
	day of, 20	, by delivering a copy thereof, with copy of Complaint attached
	and a form for Answer, in the following r	nanner:
	conc box and fill in appropriate blanks)	
[]		(used when defendant receives copy of Summon
	or refuses to receive Summons).	co (15) - Compand amidian at the
[ ]	to	a person over fifteen (15) years of age and residing at the
		. who at the time of such service was absen
	therefrom. Abode located at	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
[ ]	by posting a copy of the Summons and C	Complaint in the most public part of the premises of defendant
		(used if no person found at dwelling house or usual place of
G3	abode). Abode located at	an agent authorized to receive service of process for
[ <u>k</u> ]		
г 1	defendant CTI CAPOS BOOK	
[ ]	to	(used when defendant is a minor or an incompetent person).
[ ]	to	
. ]	authorized to receive service) (used when	defendant is corporation or association subject to a suit under a
	common name, a land grant board of trust	tees, the State of New Mexico or any political subdivision).
Fees:	\$ 75.00	
	<b>A</b> 70	/ Vally Plan
*Subso	cribed and sworn to before me this 30	Signature of Person Making Service
day of		
•	The state of the	Title (if any)
_(_	Medic Parks	$a_{1,2,3,4}$ , $a_{1,2,4}$
Judge,	Notary or Other Officer	LESLIE BOLKS
Author	rized to Administer Oaths	NOTARY PUBLIC
	Notary	SEAL SOUTH DAKOTA
Officia	al Title	المراجعة الم المراجعة المراجعة ال
		on one of the state of the stat
		ff of a New Mexico county; the signature of the shoriff or deputy
need n	ot be notarized.	
		NOV. 1.3.200e
	(If service is by mail, 4-208 must	be completed and mailed with this summation
		EXHIBIT S/-1.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

### AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

State of New Mexico	County of Santz Fe	Magistrate Cou
Case Number: M-49-CV-2008-01237-DIV.03		į
Pinintiff: Albert F, Catanach Jr.		
₩ <b>5</b> .		
Defendant. Citi Carde/Betik		
For: Albert Catanach		
Received by Front Range Legal Process Service to Larson, 701 East 50th Street North, Sioux Falls,	be served on CITI CARDE/BANK Lagal De	partment, Atm; 8. being duly
Lereon, 701 East Soth Street North, Sieux Falla, awarn, depose and say that on the	plasmi; in accordance with state absorbe in the	nd service by the mainner marked
() PUBLIC AGENCY: By serving	a,a,a,a,	of
the within-named agancy.		
CORPORATE SERVICE By serving Of	ole Houck as	1
A coministrative asisto	At	
() OTHER SERVICE: As described in the Comment	be below by serving	
COMMENTS:		Ţ
COMMENTA:		
I certify that I have no interest in the above action, a	m of legal age and have proper authority in t	the jurisdiction in
which this service was made.		
IRIC TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY		}
		1
NOV 03 2006		a l
97.1		// }
MAGISTICAL COURT	1 Alalle W	dt + 1
	- NORTH	the same
Subscribed and Sworn to before me on the de	PROCESS SERVER #	
personally known to me	with State Statutes	}
DIOUR TOUR	Front Runge Legal Process Servi	ice
NOYARY PUBLIC	826 Rome Valley Dr. Fort Collins, CO 80626	}
LESLA: BOLKS	(886) 367-2763	<b>,</b>
MOTO RY BUTLIC SEM	Our Job Sarial Number: 200600452	<b>1</b>
GOGE SOUTH DAKOTA GE THE B 1902 2000 DOCUM	no Senture, no Prazed i Se ners Tão seu MARI	{
		1

Case 1:06-cv-01115-<u>LH</u>-RHS Document 1 Filed 11/15/06 Page 10 of 10

I.egal Department
701 East 50th Street North
PO Box 6034
Sioux Falls. SD 57117

M-49-CV-2000 01237-P-3